UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,599	11/08/2006	Byeong Han Jang	3427-0139PUS1	4760
2292 7590 06/19/2008 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			EXAMINER	
PO BOX 747	CH 3/4 22040 0747	FRIDIE JR, WILLMON		
FALLS CHURG	CH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/19/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/539,599	JANG ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Willmon Fridie	3724
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period in Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 Jac</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowangles of the practice under Expensive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 Jac</u> This action is FINAL.	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-13 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-13 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. Is have been received in Applicati In rity documents have been receive U (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Art Unit: 3724

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-4, 6, 10, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Astrom ('311).

Astrom ('311) discloses (1) a milling cutter, comprising: a cutter body provided with a plurality of insert seats (8); and a cutting insert (9) having a hexahedral shape and inserted into and fastened to each of the insert seats in either of two directions, wherein the cutting insert comprises: a through hole (10) formed in the cutting insert from an upper surface to a lower surface of the cutting insert and first and second cutting blade parts (19,19') having the same shape and provided on first and second ends of the cutting insert, respectively, wherein the insert seats are radially formed inwards around a circumferential outer surface of the cutter body and are spaced apart from each other at regular intervals, and each of the insert seats comprises first and second locking holes respectively formed on first and second inner surfaces of the insert seat, so that the cutting insert is fastened to the insert seat by a locking screw which is tightened into the

Application/Control Number: 10/539,599 Page 3

Art Unit: 3724

first or second locking hole of the insert seat after passing through the through hole of the cutting insert. With respect to claims 4 and 6, Astrom discloses rounded corner blades H1 and H2; and an inclined blade surface formed by the countersink (28).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Astrom ('311).

With respect to claims 7 and 8, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the cutting insert of whatever form or shape was desired or expedient. A change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art, absent any showing of unexpected results. In re Dailey et al., 149 USPQ

47. It appears that there would be no new or unexpected result from such a modification.

With respect to claim 9, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed ratio, since it has been held

that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering

the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105

USPQ 233.

In regard to claim 13, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to provide the cutting insert blade with four edges,

since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device

involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8. It

appears that there would be no new or unexpected result from such a modification.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Willmon Fridie whose telephone number is 571 272

4476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, ASHLEY BOYER can be reached on 571 272 4502. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/539,599 Page 5

Art Unit: 3724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

wf /Willmon Fridie/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724